

Date: Mon, 14 Mar 94 04:30:12 PST  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #130  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Mon, 14 Mar 94                      Volume 94 : Issue 130

Today's Topics:

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.  
-----

Date: 14 Mar 1994 05:00:20 -0600  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!cs.utexas.edu!swrinde!menudo.uh.edu!uuneo.NeoSoft.com!  
sugar.NeoSoft.COM!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1994Mar11.050320.28132@nosc.mil>, <2lqajc\$d7n@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>,  
<1994Mar12.022618.14826@nosc.mil>  
Subject : Re: Coord. priority for open repeaters

In article <1994Mar12.022618.14826@nosc.mil>,  
Roger Keating <keating@nosc.mil> wrote:

>I just don't like the way amateur radio frequencies are set aside as  
>private frequencies. Don't tell me that there is nothing to not like  
>because there are good reasons for the current spectrum allocation  
>arrangements; I know the reasons and still don't like it. But there  
>are plenty of things I don't like, and mostly I just tolerate it and  
>get on with the day. In fact I think I'll do that now.  
>

The real problem is there's no good way to change the situation without making  
everyone mad. That's the real problem with being a frequency coordinator -  
You're always deciding who you are going to make mad...

--

Jim Reese, WD5IYT | "Reality is for those with no imagination."  
jreese@sugar.neosoft.com | --Jim McClellan

-----

Date: 14 Mar 1994 05:19:02 -0600  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!menudo.uh.edu!uuneo.NeoSoft.com!sugar.NeoSoft.COM!  
not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1994Mar10.232658.6028@enterprise.rdd.lmsc.lockheed.com>,  
<2lqads\$d27@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>,  
<1994Mar11.235940.26309@enterprise.rdd.lmsc.lockheed.com>Ã  
Subject : Re: Coord. priority for open repeaters

In article <1994Mar11.235940.26309@enterprise.rdd.lmsc.lockheed.com>,  
George Lyle (233789) <glyle@marie.seas.ucla.edu> wrote:  
>Jim, your main objection seems to be the possibility of lawsuits. I did not  
propose  
>that closed repeaters be denied the privelege of operating. What I proposed was  
>that those who wish to serve the \_entire\_ amateur community be given first shot  
at  
>coordination. Anyone can run an uncoordinated system! Those who want to run  
private  
>machines would still be able to. The only thing that will change is that they  
will  
>not be coordinated.  
>

I admit I'm a bit sensitive to this. When I was the 2 meter frequency  
coordinator for North Texas, the Texas VHF-FM Society was sued because of a  
decision I made regarding a dispute between two open repeaters. The dispute  
arose from a disagreement between the trustee of the repeater (whose call was  
on it) and the President of the club who ran the machine. The trustee never  
allowed his coordination to be tranferred to the club. When a duspute arose,  
the trustee took his ball and went home. The club wanted the coordinator to  
give them control of the frequency. Unfortunately, I didn't have any grounds  
to do this and had to rule in favor of the trustee. I didn't want to do this,  
but the Texas VHF-FM Society rules were very clear. When the incident was  
reported in the newsletter of the Texas VHF-FM Society, the President of the  
club sued the society and its officers for libel and slander. The lawsuit  
paralyzed the society for two years, and caused me to resign as frequency  
coordinator. It was the worst experience I've had in my 15 years as a ham.

This incident cause the FM Society to completely rewrite its coordination policies to make it easier for trustees of club repeaters to transfer the coordination to the name of the club. Hopefully this kind of thing will never happen again.

I have been a frequency coordinator, and I operate both open and closed repeaters. Both have their place. It's unfortunate that some parts of the country have evolved such that closed systems outnumber open ones. This is not the case in much of the US.

--

Jim Reese, WD5IYT | "Reality is for those with no imagination."  
jreese@sugar.neosoft.com | --Jim McClellan

-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #130

\*\*\*\*\*